arXiv:1606.01526v2 [math.FA] 13 Jun 2016

Distances between classes in $W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$

Haim Brezis[1,3], Petru Mironescu[2] and Itai Shafrir[3]

[1]Department of Mathematics, Rutgers University, USA
[2]Université de Lyon, Université Lyon 1, CNRS UMR 5208, Institut Camille Jordan, 69622 Villeurbanne, France
[3]Department of Mathematics, Technion - I.I.T., 32 000 Haifa, Israel

June 14, 2016

Abstract

We introduce an equivalence relation on the space $W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$ which classifies maps according to their "topological singularities". We establish sharp bounds for the distances (in the usual sense and in the Hausdorff sense) between the equivalence classes. Similar questions are examined for the space $W^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$ when $p>1$.

1 Introduction

Let Ω be a smooth bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$, $N\geq 2$. (Many of the results in this paper remain valid if Ω is replaced by a manifold $\mathcal{M}$, with or without boundary, and the case $\mathcal{M}=\mathbb{S}^1$ is already of interest (see [8, 9])). In some places we will assume in addition that Ω is simply connected (and this will be mentioned explicitly). Our basic setting is

$$W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)=\{u\in W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^2)\simeq W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{C});\ |u|=1 \text{ a.e.}\}.$$

We now introduce an equivalence relation in $W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$:

$$u\sim v \text{ if and only if } u=e^{i\varphi}\,v \text{ for some } \varphi\in W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}). \tag{1.1}$$

We denote by $\mathcal{E}(u)$ the equivalence class of an element $u\in W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$. In particular,

$$\mathcal{E}(1)=\{u\in W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1);\ u=e^{i\varphi} \text{ for some } \varphi\in W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{R})\}.$$

It is easy to see (using (1.6)–(1.7) below) that $\mathcal{E}(u)$ is closed in $W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$.

Clearly

$$\mathcal{E}(1)\subset \overline{C^\infty(\overline{\Omega};\mathbb{S}^1)}^{W^{1,1}}; \tag{1.2}$$

however equality in (1.2) fails in general. For example when $\Omega=\{x\in\mathbb{R}^2;\ 1<|x|<2\}$, the map $u(x)=x/|x|$ is smooth, but $u\notin\mathcal{E}(1)$ since it cannot be written as $u=e^{i\varphi}$ for some $\varphi\in W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{R})$; the nonexistence of φ is an easy consequence of degree theory (such an

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 58D15; Secondary 46E35.

argument has roots in [16], see also [2, 3, 6]). On the other hand, if Ω is simply connected, equality in (1.2) does hold since $C^\infty(\overline{\Omega};\mathbb{S}^1) \subset \mathcal{E}(1)$ and $\mathcal{E}(1)$ is closed in $W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$.

A useful device for constructing maps in the same equivalence class is the following (see Lemma 2.1 below). Let $T \in \mathrm{Lip}(\mathbb{S}^1;\mathbb{S}^1)$ be a map of degree one. Then

$$T \circ u \sim u, \ \forall\, u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1). \tag{1.3}$$

We call the attention of the reader that maps u of the form $u = e^{\imath\varphi}$ with $\varphi \in W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{R})$ belong to $W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$. However they do not exhaust $W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$: there exist maps in $W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$ which *cannot* be written as $u = e^{\imath\varphi}$ for some $\varphi \in W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{R})$. A typical example is the map $u(x) = x/|x|$ in Ω =unit disc in $\mathbb{R}^2$; see above.

To each $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$ we associate a number $\Sigma(u) \geq 0$ defined by

$$\Sigma(u) = \inf_{v\in\mathcal{E}(u)} \int_\Omega |\nabla v|. \tag{1.4}$$

Note that

$$\Sigma(u) = \inf_{\psi\in W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{R})} \int_\Omega |u \wedge \nabla u - \nabla\psi|. \tag{1.5}$$

This follows from the identities

$$(uv) \wedge \nabla(uv) = u \wedge \nabla u + v \wedge \nabla v, \qquad \forall\, u, v \in W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1), \tag{1.6}$$

$$e^{\imath\varphi} \wedge \nabla(e^{\imath\varphi}) = \nabla\varphi, \qquad \forall\, \varphi \in W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}), \tag{1.7}$$

$$\overline{u} \wedge \nabla\overline{u} = -u \wedge \nabla u, \qquad \forall\, u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1). \tag{1.8}$$

The quantity $\Sigma(u)$ was originally introduced in [7] when $N = 2$. It plays an extremely important role in many questions involving $W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$ (see [6]). Clearly $\Sigma(u) = \Sigma(\overline{u})$, and $u \sim v \implies \Sigma(u) = \Sigma(v)$. It is straightforward that

$$u \sim 1 \iff \Sigma(u) = 0; \tag{1.9}$$

in particular,

$$u \sim v \iff \Sigma(u\overline{v}) = 0. \tag{1.10}$$

Note also that

$$\Sigma(uv) \leq \Sigma(u) + \Sigma(v). \tag{1.11}$$

Given $u_0, v_0 \in W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$ the following quantities will play a crucial role throughout the paper:

$$d_{W^{1,1}}(u_0, \mathcal{E}(v_0)) := \inf_{v\sim v_0} \int_\Omega |\nabla(u_0 - v)|, \tag{1.12}$$

$$\mathrm{dist}_{W^{1,1}}(\mathcal{E}(u_0), \mathcal{E}(v_0)) := \inf_{u\sim u_0} d_{W^{1,1}}(u, \mathcal{E}(v_0)) = \inf_{u\sim u_0} \inf_{v\sim v_0} \int_\Omega |\nabla(u - v)|, \tag{1.13}$$

$$\mathrm{Dist}_{W^{1,1}}(\mathcal{E}(u_0), \mathcal{E}(v_0)) := \sup_{u\sim u_0} d_{W^{1,1}}(u, \mathcal{E}(v_0)) = \sup_{u\sim u_0} \inf_{v\sim v_0} \int_\Omega |\nabla(u - v)|, \tag{1.14}$$

so that $\mathrm{dist}_{W^{1,1}}(\mathcal{E}(u_0), \mathcal{E}(v_0))$ is precisely the distance between the classes $\mathcal{E}(u_0)$ and $\mathcal{E}(v_0)$. On the other hand we will see below, as a consequence of (1.16), that $\mathrm{Dist}_{W^{1,1}}$ is symmetric, a fact which is not clear from its definition. This implies that $\mathrm{Dist}_{W^{1,1}}$ coincides with the Hausdorff distance

$$H - \mathrm{dist}_{W^{1,1}}(\mathcal{E}(u_0), \mathcal{E}(v_0)) := \max\left(\mathrm{Dist}_{W^{1,1}}(\mathcal{E}(u_0), \mathcal{E}(v_0)),\ \mathrm{Dist}_{W^{1,1}}(\mathcal{E}(v_0), \mathcal{E}(u_0))\right)$$

between $\mathcal{E}(u_0)$ and $\mathcal{E}(v_0)$. Our main result is

Theorem 1.1. *For every $u_0, v_0 \in W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$ we have*

$$\operatorname{dist}_{W^{1,1}}(\mathcal{E}(u_0),\mathcal{E}(v_0)) = \frac{2}{\pi}\Sigma(u_0\overline{v}_0) \tag{1.15}$$

and

$$\operatorname{Dist}_{W^{1,1}}(\mathcal{E}(u_0),\mathcal{E}(v_0)) = \Sigma(u_0\overline{v}_0). \tag{1.16}$$

The two assertions in Theorem 1.1 look very simple but the proofs are quite tricky; they are presented in Sections 2 and 3. The proof of inequality "$\leq$" in (1.16) uses a version of the "dipole construction":

Proposition 1.2. *(H. Brezis and P. Mironescu [6, Proposition 2.1]) Let $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$. Then there exists a sequence $\{u_n\} \subset \mathcal{E}(u)$ satisfying*

$$u_n \to 1 \text{ a.e., and } \lim_{n\to\infty}\int_\Omega |\nabla u_n| = \Sigma(u). \tag{1.17}$$

For completeness we present the proof of Proposition 1.2 in the Appendix.

A basic ingredient in the proof of inequality "$\geq$" in (1.16) is the following proposition which provides an explicit recipe for constructing "maximizing sequences" for $\operatorname{Dist}_{W^{1,1}}$. In order to describe it we first introduce, for each $n \geq 3$, a map $T_n \in \operatorname{Lip}(\mathbb{S}^1;\mathbb{S}^1)$ with $\deg T_n = 1$ by $T_n(e^{\imath\theta}) = e^{\imath\tau_n(\theta)}$, with τ_n defined on $[0, 2\pi]$ by setting $\tau_n(0) = 0$ and

$$\tau_n'(\theta) = \begin{cases} n, & \theta \in [2j\,\pi/n^2), (2j+1)\,\pi/n^2] \\ -(n-2), & \theta \in ((2j+1)\,\pi/n^2), (2j+2)\,\pi/n^2] \end{cases}, \ j = 0, 1, \ldots, n^2-1. \tag{1.18}$$

Proposition 1.3. *For every $u_0, v_0 \in W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$ such that $u_0 \not\sim v_0$ we have*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{d_{W^{1,1}}(T_n \circ u_0, \mathcal{E}(v_0))}{\Sigma(u_0\overline{v}_0)} = 1 \tag{1.19}$$

and the limit is uniform *over all such u_0 and v_0. Consequently*

$$\operatorname{Dist}(\mathcal{E}(u_0),\mathcal{E}(v_0)) \geq \Sigma(u_0\overline{v}_0). \tag{1.20}$$

Remark 1.4. When Ω is *simply connected* there is an alternative point of view on the equivalence relation $u \sim v$ using the Jacobian of u. For every $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$ consider the antisymmetric matrix with coefficients in $\mathcal{D}'$ defined by

$$Ju := \frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}\left(u \wedge \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_j}\right) - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}\left(u \wedge \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}\right)\right].$$

One can show (see [10] and [3, 6]) that $\forall\, u, v \in W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$,

$$u \sim v \text{ if and only if } J(u\overline{v}) = Ju - Jv = 0. \tag{1.21}$$

Remark 1.5. In order to have a more explicit description of the equivalence relation $u \sim v$ and of $\Sigma(u)$ it is instructive to understand what it means when $N = 2$ and Ω is simply connected, for $u, v \in \mathcal{R}$, where

$$\mathcal{R} = \{u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1);\ u \text{ is smooth except at a finite number of points}\}.$$

The class $\mathcal{R}$ plays an important role since it is dense in $W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$ (see [2, 6]). If $u \in \mathcal{R}$ then $Ju = \pi\sum k_j\delta_{a_j}$ where a_j are the singular points of u and $k_j := \deg(u, a_j)$. In particular, when $u, v \in \mathcal{R}$, then $u \sim v$ if and only if u and v have the same singularities and the same degree for each singularity. Moreover, $\Sigma(u) = 2\pi\, L(u)$ where $L(u)$ is the length of minimal connection between "positive points" and the "negative points", allowing connection to the boundary (for more precise statements see [6, 7]).

A special case of interest is the distance of a given $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$ to the class $\mathcal{E}(1)$. An immediate consequence of Theorem 1.1 is that for every $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$ we have

$$\frac{2}{\pi}\Sigma(u) \le d_{W^{1,1}}(u,\mathcal{E}(1)) \le \Sigma(u), \tag{1.22}$$

and the bounds are optimal in the sense that

$$\sup_{\substack{u\\ \Sigma(u)>0}} \frac{d_{W^{1,1}}(u,\mathcal{E}(1))}{\Sigma(u)} = 1, \tag{1.23}$$

and

$$\inf_{\substack{u\\ \Sigma(u)>0}} \frac{d_{W^{1,1}}(u,\mathcal{E}(1))}{\Sigma(u)} = \frac{2}{\pi}. \tag{1.24}$$

There are challenging problems concerning the question whether the supremum and the infimum in the above formulas are achieved (see §3.3).

Remark 1.6. It was established in [6, Sec. 11.6] that

$$\frac{1}{2}\Sigma(u) \le d_{W^{1,1}}(u,\mathcal{E}(1)) \le \Sigma(u), \ \forall\, u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1). \tag{1.25}$$

Earlier results concerning the upper bound in (1.25) can be found in [1, 13].

Finally, we turn in Section 4 to the classes in $W^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$, $1 < p < \infty$, defined in an analogous way to the $W^{1,1}$-case, i.e., using the equivalence relation

$$u \sim v \text{ if and only if } u = e^{\imath\varphi}\, v \text{ for some } \varphi \in W^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}). \tag{1.26}$$

We point out that if $u, v \in W^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$ are equivalent according to the equivalence relation in (1.1), then from the relation $e^{\imath\varphi} = u\overline{v}$ we deduce that

$$\nabla\varphi = (u\overline{v}) \wedge \nabla(u\overline{v}) \in L^p(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N); \tag{1.27}$$

whence $u \sim v$ according to (1.26) as well. When $p \ge 2$ and Ω is simply connected we have $W^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1) = \{u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1);\ u = e^{\imath\varphi} \text{ for some } \varphi \in W^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{R})\}$, see Remark 1.14 below. Therefore, the only cases of interest are:

(a) general Ω and $1 < p < 2$,
(b) multiply connected Ω and $p \ge 2$.
In all the theorems below we assume that we are in one of these situations. The distances between the classes are defined analogously to (1.13)–(1.14) by

$$\operatorname{dist}_{W^{1,p}}(\mathcal{E}(u_0),\mathcal{E}(v_0)) := \inf_{u\sim u_0}\inf_{v\sim v_0} \|\nabla(u-v)\|_{L^p(\Omega)}. \tag{1.28}$$

and

$$\operatorname{Dist}_{W^{1,p}}(\mathcal{E}(u_0),\mathcal{E}(v_0)) := \sup_{u\sim u_0}\inf_{v\sim v_0} \|\nabla(u-v)\|_{L^p(\Omega)}. \tag{1.29}$$

The next result establishes a lower bound for $\operatorname{dist}_{W^{1,p}}$:

Theorem 1.7. *For every $u_0, v_0 \in W^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$, $1 < p < \infty$, we have*

$$\operatorname{dist}_{W^{1,p}}(\mathcal{E}(u_0),\mathcal{E}(v_0)) \geq \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right) \inf_{w\sim u_0\overline{v}_0} \|\nabla w\|_{L^p(\Omega)}. \tag{1.30}$$

Remark 1.8. For $p > 1$ the infimum on the R.H.S. of (1.30) is actually a minimum; this follows easily from (1.27) and the fact that $W^{1,p}$ is reflexive.

Note that equality in (1.30) holds for $p = 1$ by (1.15). An example in [14, Section 4] shows that strict inequality ">" may occur in (1.30) for a multiply connected domain in dimension two and $p = 2$. We will show in §4.4 that strict inequality may also occur for simply connected domains when $1 < p < 2$. On the positive side, we prove equality in (1.30) in the case of the distance to $\mathcal{E}(1)$:

Theorem 1.9. *For every $u_0 \in W^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$, $1 < p < \infty$, we have*

$$\operatorname{dist}_{W^{1,p}}(\mathcal{E}(u_0),\mathcal{E}(1)) = \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right) \inf_{w\sim u_0} \|\nabla w\|_{L^p(\Omega)}. \tag{1.31}$$

Remark 1.10. When $p > 1$ we do not know general conditions on $u_0, v_0 \in W^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$ that guarantee equality in (1.30) (a sufficient condition in the case of multiply connected two dimensional domain and $p = 2$ is given in [14, Th. 4]).

On the other hand, when $p > 1$, $\operatorname{Dist}_{W^{1,p}}$ between distinct classes is infinite:

Theorem 1.11. *For every $u_0, v_0 \in W^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$, $1 < p < \infty$, such that $u_0 \not\sim v_0$ we have*

$$\operatorname{Dist}_{W^{1,p}}(\mathcal{E}(u_0),\mathcal{E}(v_0)) = \infty. \tag{1.32}$$

Remark 1.12. A simple but useful property of the equivalence relation that we defined in $W^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$, $p \geq 1$, is the following: $u \sim u_0$ and $v \sim v_0$ imply $uv \sim u_0v_0$. This "group property" reflects the fact that our classes are the cosets $\{gH;\ g \in G\}$ of the subgroup

$$H = \{u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1);\ u = e^{i\varphi} \text{ for some } \varphi \in W^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{R})\}$$

of the group $G = W^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$.

Remark 1.13. The quantity $\operatorname{dist}_{W^{1,p}}$ for $\mathbb{S}^1$-valued maps was studied in [14] (and in [12] for $\mathbb{S}^N$-valued maps, $N \geq 2$). In [14] distances between classes were investigated in two different settings: (i) $W^{1,p}(\mathbb{S}^1;\mathbb{S}^1)$, $p \geq 1$ and (ii) $W^{1,2}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$, where Ω is a multiply connected domain in $\mathbb{R}^2$. A comprehensive study of distances in $W^{s,p}(\mathbb{S}^N;\mathbb{S}^N)$ $(sp \geq N)$ is carried out in [8].

Remark 1.14. There is another natural equivalence relation in $W^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, defined by the homotopy classes, i.e.,

$$u \overset{\mathcal{H}}{\sim} v \text{ if and only if } u = h(0) \text{ and } v = h(1) \text{ for some } h \in C\left([0,1];W^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)\right).$$

Homotopy classes have been well-studied (see [4, 5, 11, 15, 17]). Here are three basic facts valid for a general domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, $N \geq 2$ (see [5]):

a) If $1 \leq p < 2$, then $u \overset{\mathcal{H}}{\sim} v$, $\forall\, u, v \in W^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$.
b) If $2 \leq p < \infty$, then $u \overset{\mathcal{H}}{\sim} v \iff u \sim v$, $\forall\, u, v \in W^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$.
c) If $2 \leq p < \infty$, then $W^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$ and $C^0(\overline{\Omega};\mathbb{S}^1)$ have the same homotopy classes in the sense that any $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$ is $W^{1,p}$-homotopic to some $u_1 \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega};\mathbb{S}^1)$; moreover $u_1, v_1 \in$

$C^\infty(\overline{\Omega};\mathbb{S}^1)$ are C^0-homotopic if and only if u_1, v_1 are $W^{1,p}$-homotopic. In particular, if Ω is simply connected and $p \geq 2$, then $u \overset{\mathcal{H}}{\sim} v$ and $u \sim v$, $\forall\, u, v \in W^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$. Note that when $1 \leq p < 2$ the equivalence relation $u \sim v$ is *much more restrictive* than $u \overset{\mathcal{H}}{\sim} v$; for example let Ω =unit disc in $\mathbb{R}^2$, $u(x) = x/|x|$ and $v(x) = (x-a)/|x-a|$ with $0 \neq a \in \mathbb{R}^2$, then $u \not\sim v$ (see Remark 1.5) while $u \overset{\mathcal{H}}{\sim} v$, e.g., via the homotopy $h(t) = (x-ta)/|x-ta|$, $0 \leq t \leq 1$.

Part of the results were announced in [9].

Acknowledgments

The first author (HB) was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1207793. The second author (PM) was partially supported by the LABEX MILYON (ANR-10-LABX-0070) of Université de Lyon, within the program "Investissements d'Avenir" (ANR-11-IDEX-0007) operated by the French National Research Agency (ANR). The third author (IS) was supported by the Israel Science Foundation (Grant No. 999/13).

2 Proof of (1.15) in Theorem 1.1

2.1 A basic lower bound inequality

We begin with a simple lemma about composition with Lipschitz maps; it provides a very useful device for constructing maps in the same equivalence class, or in the class $\mathcal{E}(1)$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $T \in Lip(\mathbb{S}^1;\mathbb{S}^1)$ be a map of degree D. Then*

$$T \circ u \sim u^D, \ \forall\, u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1). \tag{2.1}$$

Proof. Since $T(z)/z^D$ is a Lipschitz self-map of $\mathbb{S}^1$ of zero degree, there exists $g \in Lip(\mathbb{S}^1;\mathbb{R})$ such that $T(z)/z^D = e^{\imath g(z)}$. The function $\varphi(x) = g(u(x))$ belongs to $W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{R})$ and satisfies $T(u(x)) = (u(x))^D e^{\imath\varphi(x)}$, and (2.1) follows by the definition of the equivalence relation. □

The next simple lemma is essential for the proof of the lower bound in (1.22).

Lemma 2.2. *For any $w \in W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$ we have*

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla(|w-1|)| \geq \frac{2}{\pi}\Sigma(w). \tag{2.2}$$

Proof. As in [14], we define $T : \mathbb{S}^1 \to \mathbb{S}^1$ by

$$T(e^{\imath\varphi}) := e^{\imath\theta} \text{ with } \theta = \theta(\varphi) = \pi \sin(\varphi/2), \ \forall\, \varphi \in (-\pi, \pi], \tag{2.3}$$

so that

$$|e^{\imath\varphi} - 1| = 2|\sin(\varphi/2)| = \frac{2}{\pi}|\theta|. \tag{2.4}$$

Clearly T is of class C^1 and its degree equals to one. We claim that

$$|\nabla(|w-1|)| = \frac{2}{\pi}|\nabla(T \circ w)| \text{ a.e.} \tag{2.5}$$

This is a consequence of the standard fact that, if $F \in \mathrm{Lip}(\mathbb{S}^1;\mathbb{R}^2) \cap C^1(\mathbb{S}^1 \setminus \{1\})$ and $w \in W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$, then $F \circ w \in W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$ and, moreover,

$$\nabla(F \circ w) = \begin{cases} \dot{F}(w)\nabla w & \text{a.e. in } [w \neq 1] \\ 0 & \text{a.e. in } [w = 1] \end{cases}.$$

Integration of (2.5) leads to

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla |w-1|| = \frac{2}{\pi} \int_\Omega |\nabla(T \circ w)|. \tag{2.6}$$

By Lemma 2.1, we have $\Sigma(T \circ w) = \Sigma(w)$, and therefore (2.2) follows from (2.6). □

Corollary 2.3. *For every $u, v \in W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$ we have*

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla(u-v)| \geq \frac{2}{\pi}\Sigma(u\overline{v}). \tag{2.7}$$

Proof. Setting $w = u\overline{v}$ and applying (2.2) yields

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla(u-v)| \geq \int_\Omega |\nabla(|u-v|)| = \int_\Omega |\nabla(|w-1|)| \geq \frac{2}{\pi}\Sigma(u\overline{v}).$$ □

2.2 Proof of (1.15)

We begin by introducing some notation. For an open arc in $\mathbb{S}^1$ we use the notation

$$\mathcal{A}(\alpha,\beta) = \{\, e^{\imath\theta};\, \theta \in (\alpha,\beta)\} \tag{2.8}$$

for any $\alpha < \beta$. We shall also use a specific notation for half-circles; for every $\zeta \in \mathbb{S}^1$ write $\zeta = e^{\imath\varphi}$ with $\varphi \in (-\pi,\pi]$ and denote $I(\zeta,-\zeta) = \mathcal{A}(\varphi,\varphi+\pi)$. Note that

$$z \in I(\zeta,-\zeta) \Longleftrightarrow \zeta \in I(-z,z). \tag{2.9}$$

For each $\zeta = e^{\imath\varphi} \in \mathbb{S}^1$ define a map $P_\zeta : \mathbb{S}^1 \to \overline{I(\zeta,-\zeta)}$ by

$$P_\zeta(z) = \begin{cases} z, & \text{if } z = e^{\imath\theta} \in I(\zeta,-\zeta) \\ e^{\imath(2\varphi-\theta)} = \zeta^2\overline{z}, & \text{if } z \notin I(\zeta,-\zeta) \end{cases}, \tag{2.10}$$

so that for $z \notin I(\zeta,-\zeta)$, $P_\zeta(z)$ is the reflection of z with respect to the line $\ell_\zeta = \{t\zeta;\, t \in \mathbb{R}\}$. Next we state

Proposition 2.4. *For every $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$ we have*

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^1} \left(\int_\Omega |\nabla(u - P_\zeta \circ u)|\, dx \right) d\zeta = 4 \int_\Omega |\nabla u|\, dx. \tag{2.11}$$

Proof. For each $\zeta \in \mathbb{S}^1$ set $v_\zeta := P_\zeta \circ u$. By Lemma 2.1, $v_\zeta \in \mathcal{E}(1)$, since $\deg P_\zeta = 0$. We note that

$$z - P_\zeta(z) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } z \in I(\zeta,-\zeta) \\ z - \zeta^2\,\overline{z}, & \text{if } z \notin I(\zeta,-\zeta) \end{cases}. \tag{2.12}$$

Set $w_\zeta := u - v_\zeta$. Using (2.12), we find that for every $\zeta = e^{\imath\varphi}$ and a.e. $x \in \Omega$ we have

$$\nabla w_\zeta(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } u(x) \in I(\zeta, -\zeta) \\ \nabla u(x) - \zeta^2 \nabla \overline{u}(x), & \text{if } u(x) \notin I(\zeta, -\zeta) \end{cases}. \tag{2.13}$$

Therefore, for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ we have

$$|\nabla w_\zeta(x)| = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } u(x) \in I(\zeta, -\zeta) \\ 2|\cos(\theta - \varphi)||\nabla u(x)|, & \text{if } u(x) = e^{\imath\theta} \notin I(\zeta, -\zeta) \end{cases}. \tag{2.14}$$

Indeed, we justify (2.14) e.g. when $\zeta = 1$. In view of (2.13), we have to prove that

$$|\nabla \mathrm{Im}\, u(x)| = |\mathrm{Re}\, u(x)|\, |\nabla u(x)| \quad \text{for a.e. } x. \tag{2.15}$$

If we differentiate the identity $|u|^2 \equiv 1$, we obtain

$$\mathrm{Re}\, u\, \nabla(\mathrm{Re}\, u) + \mathrm{Im}\, u\, \nabla(\mathrm{Im}\, u) = 0 \text{ a.e.};$$

this easily implies (2.15).

Using (2.9) we find that, with $u(x) = e^{\imath\theta}$ and

$$A(x) = \{\varphi \in (-\pi, \pi];\ u(x) \notin I(e^{\imath\varphi}, -e^{\imath\varphi})\},$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} \int_\Omega |\nabla w_\zeta(x)|\, dx\, d\zeta &= \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \int_\Omega \chi_{A(x)}(\varphi)\, 2|\cos(\theta - \varphi)||\nabla u(x)|\, dx\, d\varphi \\ &= \int_\Omega |\nabla u(x)| \Big(\int_\theta^{\theta+\pi} 2|\cos(\theta - \varphi)|\, d\varphi \Big)\, dx = 4 \int_\Omega |\nabla u(x)|\, dx, \end{aligned}$$

which is (2.11). Here we have used $\int_\theta^{\theta+\pi} 2|\cos(\theta - \varphi)|\, d\varphi = \int_0^\pi 2|\cos t|\, dt = 4$. □

The identity (2.11) is a key tool in the proof of "$\leq$" in (1.15). For the convenience of the reader we shall present first the slightly simpler proof when $v_0 = 1$.

Proof of "$\leq$" in (1.15) for $v_0 = 1$. By Corollary 2.3 we have

$$\inf_{u \sim u_0} d_{W^{1,1}}(u, \mathcal{E}(1)) \geq \frac{2}{\pi} \Sigma(u_0).$$

Use (1.4) to choose a sequence $\{u_n\} \subset \mathcal{E}(u_0)$ with $\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega |\nabla u_n| = \Sigma(u_0)$. Use Proposition 2.4 to choose $\zeta_n \in \mathbb{S}^1$ such that

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla(u_n - P_{\zeta_n} \circ u_n)| \leq \frac{2}{\pi} \int_\Omega |\nabla u_n|,$$

implying that $\lim_{n\to\infty} d_{W^{1,1}}(u_n, \mathcal{E}(1)) = \frac{2}{\pi} \Sigma(u_0)$. □

Next we turn to the general case.

Proof of "$\leq$" in (1.15) for general v_0. By (2.7) we have

$$\mathrm{dist}_{W^{1,1}}(\mathcal{E}(u_0),\mathcal{E}(v_0)) \geq (2/\pi)\,\Sigma(u_0\overline{v}_0),$$

so we need to prove that this is actually an equality. By Proposition 1.2 there exists a sequence $\{w_n\}$ satisfying $w_n \sim u_0\overline{v}_0$ for all n, $\lim_{n\to\infty} w_n = 1$ a.e., and

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla w_n| = \Sigma(u_0\overline{v}_0) + \varepsilon_n, \tag{2.16}$$

with $\varepsilon_n \searrow 0$. By Proposition 2.4 we get

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^1}\int_\Omega |\nabla(w_n - P_\zeta \circ w_n)|\,dx\,d\zeta = 4\int_\Omega |\nabla w_n|\,dx = 4(\Sigma(u_0\overline{v}_0) + \varepsilon_n). \tag{2.17}$$

Hence, there exists $\zeta_n \in \mathbb{S}^1_- := \{z = e^{i\theta};\ \theta \in [-\pi, 0]\}$ such that

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla(w_n - P_{\zeta_n} \circ w_n)| + \int_\Omega |\nabla(w_n - P_{-\zeta_n} \circ w_n)| \leq \frac{4}{\pi}(\Sigma(u_0\overline{v}_0) + \varepsilon_n).$$

By (2.7) we have

$$\frac{2}{\pi}\Sigma(u_0\overline{v}_0) \leq \min\left(\int_\Omega |\nabla(w_n - P_{\zeta_n} \circ w_n)|, \int_\Omega |\nabla(w_n - P_{-\zeta_n} \circ w_n)|\right),$$

and thus

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_\Omega |\nabla(w_n - P_{\zeta_n} \circ w_n)| = \frac{2}{\pi}\Sigma(u_0\overline{v}_0). \tag{2.18}$$

Passing to a subsequence, we may assume $\zeta_n \to \zeta \in \mathbb{S}^1_-$. Therefore, $P_\zeta(1) = 1$. Denote $F_n := P_{\zeta_n} \circ w_n$. Since $w_n \to 1$ a.e., we have $\lim_{n\to\infty} F_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} P_\zeta \circ w_n = 1$ a.e., and it follows that

$$F_n - w_n \to 0 \text{ a.e.} \tag{2.19}$$

For any v such that $v \sim v_0$ we have $vF_n \sim v_0$, $vw_n \sim u_0$ and

$$\frac{2}{\pi}\Sigma(u_0\overline{v}_0) \leq \int_\Omega |\nabla(vF_n - vw_n)| \leq \int_\Omega |\nabla(F_n - w_n)| + \int_\Omega |\nabla v||F_n - w_n|. \tag{2.20}$$

From (2.18)-(2.20) we deduce that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_\Omega |\nabla(vF_n - vw_n)| = \frac{2}{\pi}\Sigma(u_0\overline{v}_0),$$

and the result follows. □

3 Proof of (1.16) in Theorem 1.1

3.1 An upper bound for $\mathrm{Dist}_{W^{1,1}}$

This short subsection is devoted to the proof of the following

Proposition 3.1. *For every u_0, v_0 in $W^{1,1}(\Omega, \mathbb{S}^1)$ we have,*

$$\mathrm{Dist}_{W^{1,1}}(\mathcal{E}(u_0), \mathcal{E}(v_0)) = \sup_{u \sim u_0} d_{W^{1,1}}(u, \mathcal{E}(v_0)) \leq \Sigma(u_0 \overline{v}_0). \tag{3.1}$$

Proof. We adapt an argument from [6]. By Proposition 1.2 there exists a sequence $\{w_n\} \subset W^{1,1}(\Omega; \mathbb{S}^1)$ satisfying $w_n \sim u_0 \overline{v}_0$, $w_n \to 1$ a.e., and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega |\nabla w_n| = \Sigma(u_0 \overline{v}_0)$. For a given $u \in \mathcal{E}(u_0)$ define $v_n = u\overline{w}_n$ for all n. Then, $v_n \sim v_0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} d_{W^{1,1}}(u, \mathcal{E}(v_0)) \leq \int_\Omega |\nabla(u - v_n)| &= \int_\Omega |\nabla(u(1 - \overline{w}_n))| \\ &\leq \int_\Omega |1 - w_n||\nabla u| + \int_\Omega |\nabla w_n| \to \Sigma(u_0 \overline{v}_0). \end{aligned}$$

□

3.2 A lower bound for $\mathrm{Dist}_{W^{1,1}}$

We begin with the following elementary geometric lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *Let z_1 and z_2 two points in $\mathbb{S}^1$ satisfying, for some $\varepsilon \in (0, \pi/2)$,*

$$d_{\mathbb{S}^1}(z_1, z_2) \in (\varepsilon, \pi - \varepsilon). \tag{3.2}$$

If the vectors $v_1, v_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ satisfy

$$v_j \perp z_j,\ j = 1, 2, \tag{3.3}$$

then

$$|v_1 - v_2| \geq (\sin \varepsilon)|v_j|, j = 1, 2, \tag{3.4}$$

and in particular

$$|v_1 - v_2|^2 \geq \left(\frac{\sin^2 \varepsilon}{2}\right)(|v_1|^2 + |v_2|^2). \tag{3.5}$$

Note that the inequality (3.5) can be viewed as a "reverse triangle inequality".

Proof. From the assumptions (3.2)–(3.3) it follows that

$$< v_1, v_2 > \leq (\cos \varepsilon)|v_1||v_2|,$$

and then

$$|v_1 - v_2|^2 \geq |v_1|^2 + |v_2|^2 - 2(\cos \varepsilon)|v_1||v_2| \geq (\sin \varepsilon)^2 |v_j|^2,\ j = 1, 2.$$

□

An immediate consequence of Lemma 3.2 is

Lemma 3.3. *Let $v, \widetilde{u} \in W^{1,1}(\Omega; \mathbb{S}^1)$ and denote, for $\varepsilon \in (0, \pi/2)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} A_\varepsilon :&= \{x \in \Omega;\ d_{\mathbb{S}^1}(\widetilde{u}(x), v(x)) \in (\varepsilon, \pi - \varepsilon)\} \\ &= \{x \in \Omega;\ 2\sin(\varepsilon/2) < |\widetilde{u}(x) - v(x)| < 2\cos(\varepsilon/2)\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

Then

$$|\nabla(\widetilde{u} - v)| \geq (\sin \varepsilon)|\nabla \widetilde{u}| \text{ a.e. in } A_\varepsilon. \tag{3.7}$$

Proof. Since $v \perp v_{x_i}$ and $\widetilde{u} \perp \widetilde{u}_{x_i}$ a.e. on Ω for $i = 1, \dots, N$, we may apply Lemma 3.2 with $z_1 = \widetilde{u}(x), z_2 = v(x), v_1 = \widetilde{u}_{x_i}(x)$ and $v_2 = v_{x_i}(x)$ to obtain

$$|\widetilde{u}_{x_i} - v_{x_i}|^2 \geq (\sin \varepsilon)^2 |\widetilde{u}_{x_i}|^2, \quad \text{a.e. in } A_\varepsilon, \ i = 1, \dots, N.$$

Summing over i yields (3.7). □

The next lemma is the main ingredient in the proof of Proposition 1.3.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $u, \widetilde{u}, v \in W^{1,1}(\Omega; \mathbb{S}^1)$, $\varepsilon \in (0, \pi/20)$ and A_ε as in (3.6). Assume that*

$$|u(x) - \widetilde{u}(x)| \leq \varepsilon, \ \forall\, x \in \Omega. \tag{3.8}$$

Then,

$$\int_{A_\varepsilon} |\nabla(v - \widetilde{u})| \geq (1 - 6\varepsilon)\Sigma(v\overline{u}) - 2\int_{A_\varepsilon} |\nabla u|. \tag{3.9}$$

Proof. Note first that (3.8) implies that $\widetilde{u} \sim u$. Indeed, the image of the map $\widetilde{u}\,\overline{u}$ is contained in an arc of $\mathbb{S}^1$ of length$\leq 2\arcsin(\varepsilon/2)$, so there exists $\varphi \in W^{1,1}(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$ such that $\widetilde{u} = e^{i\varphi}u$. Hence, setting $w := v/u = v\,\overline{u}$ and $\widetilde{w} := v/\widetilde{u}$, we have also $\widetilde{w} \sim w$. Consider the map

$$W := \overline{u}(v - \widetilde{u}) + 1 = w + (1 - \widetilde{u}/u). \tag{3.10}$$

By the triangle inequality,

$$|\nabla W| = |\nabla\left(\overline{u}(v - \widetilde{u})\right)| \leq 2|\nabla \overline{u}| + |\nabla(v - \widetilde{u})|,$$

whence

$$\int_{A_\varepsilon} |\nabla(v - \widetilde{u})| \geq \int_{A_\varepsilon} |\nabla W| - 2\int_{A_\varepsilon} |\nabla u|. \tag{3.11}$$

By (3.8), $|W - w| = |1 - \widetilde{u}/u| = |u - \widetilde{u}| \leq \varepsilon$ in Ω. Hence

$$\big||W| - 1\big| \leq |W - w| \leq \varepsilon \ \text{ in } \Omega, \tag{3.12}$$

and also

$$|\widetilde{w} - w| = |\widetilde{u} - u| \leq \varepsilon \ \text{ in } \Omega. \tag{3.13}$$

Consider the map $\widetilde{W} := W/|W|$, which thanks to (3.12) belongs to $W^{1,1}(\Omega; \mathbb{S}^1)$. Furthermore, again by (3.12),

$$|\widetilde{W} - w| \leq |\widetilde{W} - W| + |W - w| \leq 2\varepsilon \text{ in } \Omega, \tag{3.14}$$

implying in particular that

$$\widetilde{W} \in \mathcal{E}(w). \tag{3.15}$$

Combining (3.14) with (3.13) yields

$$|\widetilde{W} - \widetilde{w}| \leq 3\varepsilon \text{ and } d_{\mathbb{S}^1}(\widetilde{W}, \widetilde{w}) \leq 6\varepsilon \text{ in } \Omega. \tag{3.16}$$

A direct consequence of (3.12) is the pointwise inequality in Ω

$$|\nabla W| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)|\nabla \widetilde{W}|,$$

which together with (3.11) yields

$$\int_{A_\varepsilon} |\nabla(v-\widetilde{u})| \geq (1-\varepsilon)\int_{A_\varepsilon} |\nabla\widetilde{W}| - 2\int_{A_\varepsilon} |\nabla u|. \tag{3.17}$$

Since

$$A_\varepsilon = \{x\in\Omega;\ \widetilde{w}(x)\in\mathcal{A}(\varepsilon,\pi-\varepsilon)\cup\mathcal{A}(\pi+\varepsilon,2\pi-\varepsilon)\} \quad \text{(see (3.6) and (2.8))},$$

we deduce from (3.16) that

$$B_\varepsilon := \{x\in\Omega;\ \widetilde{W}(x)\in\mathcal{A}(7\varepsilon,\pi-7\varepsilon)\cup\mathcal{A}(\pi+7\varepsilon,2\pi-7\varepsilon)\}\subseteq A_\varepsilon. \tag{3.18}$$

For each $\delta\in(0,\pi/2)$ consider the map $K_\delta:\mathbb{S}^1\to\mathbb{S}^1$ defined by

$$K_\delta(e^{\imath\theta}) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } -\delta\leq\theta<\delta \\ e^{\imath\pi(\theta-\delta)/(\pi-2\delta)}, & \text{if } \delta\leq\theta<\pi-\delta \\ -1, & \text{if } \pi-\delta\leq\theta<\pi+\delta \\ -e^{\imath\pi(\theta-\pi-\delta)/(\pi-2\delta)}, & \text{if } \pi+\delta\leq\theta<2\pi-2\delta \end{cases}. \tag{3.19}$$

Clearly $K_\delta\in\mathrm{Lip}(\mathbb{S}^1;\mathbb{S}^1)$ with $\|\dot{K}_\delta\|_\infty=\pi/(\pi-2\delta)$ and $\deg(K_\delta)=1$. Therefore, by (3.15) and Lemma 2.1

$$w_1 := K_{7\varepsilon}\circ\widetilde{W}\in\mathcal{E}(w). \tag{3.20}$$

Note that by definition, $\nabla w_1=0$ a.e. on $\Omega\setminus B_\varepsilon$, so by (3.18) and (3.20) we have

$$\int_{A_\varepsilon}|\nabla\widetilde{W}| \geq \int_{B_\varepsilon}|\nabla\widetilde{W}| \geq (1-5\varepsilon)\int_{B_\varepsilon}|\nabla w_1| = (1-5\varepsilon)\int_\Omega|\nabla w_1| \geq (1-5\varepsilon)\Sigma(w). \tag{3.21}$$

Plugging (3.21) in (3.17) yields

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{A_\varepsilon}|\nabla(v-\widetilde{u})| &\geq (1-\varepsilon)\int_{B_\varepsilon}|\nabla\widetilde{W}| - 2\int_{A_\varepsilon}|\nabla u| \\ &\geq (1-\varepsilon)(1-5\varepsilon)\Sigma(w) - 2\int_{A_\varepsilon}|\nabla u| \geq (1-6\varepsilon)\Sigma(w) - 2\int_{A_\varepsilon}|\nabla u|,\end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

and (3.9) follows. □

The next result is a direct consequence of Lemma 3.4.

Corollary 3.5. *There exists a universal constant C such that for every $\varepsilon>0$ we have*

$$n\geq 1/\varepsilon^2 \implies \int_\Omega|\nabla(T_n\circ u)-v| \geq (1-C\varepsilon)\,\Sigma(u\overline{v}),\ \ \forall\, u,v\in W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1). \tag{3.23}$$

Proof. We shall use two basic properties of T_n:

$$d_{\mathbb{S}^1}(x,T_n(x)) \leq \frac{\pi(n-1)}{n^2},\ \ \forall\, x\in\mathbb{S}^1, \tag{3.24}$$

$$|\dot{T}_n|\geq n-2 \quad \text{a.e. in } \mathbb{S}^1. \tag{3.25}$$

Clearly it suffices to consider $\varepsilon<\pi/20$. Hence for $n\geq 1/\varepsilon^2$ we can apply Lemma 3.4 with $\widetilde{u}:=T_n\circ u$ (thanks to (3.24)). By (3.25) we have

$$|\nabla(T_n\circ u)|\geq(n-2)|\nabla u| \text{ a.e. on } \Omega, \tag{3.26}$$

so combining (3.7) and (3.9) gives (recall that A_ε is defined in (3.6)):

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{A_\varepsilon} |\nabla(T_n \circ u - v)| &\geq (1-6\varepsilon)\Sigma(u\overline{v}) - \frac{2}{(n-2)\,\sin\varepsilon}\int_{A_\varepsilon} |\nabla(T_n \circ u - v)| \\ &\geq (1-6\varepsilon)\Sigma(u\overline{v}) - \frac{3}{n\varepsilon}\int_{A_\varepsilon} |\nabla(T_n \circ u - v)|;\end{aligned}$$

this leads easily to (3.23). □

Proof of Proposition 1.3. Recall (see (3.1)) that

$$\mathrm{Dist}_{W^{1,1}}(\mathcal{E}(u_0), \mathcal{E}(v_0)) = \sup_{u\sim u_0} d_{W^{1,1}}(u, \mathcal{E}(v_0)) \leq \Sigma(u_0\overline{v}_0), \tag{3.27}$$

and in particular, $\forall\, n \geq 3$,

$$d_{W^{1,1}}(T_n \circ u_0, \mathcal{E}(v_0)) \leq \Sigma(u_0\overline{v}_0). \tag{3.28}$$

On the other hand, from Corollary 3.5 we know that, $\forall\, \varepsilon > 0$, $\forall\, n \geq 1/\varepsilon^2$,

$$d_{W^{1,1}}(T_n \circ u_0, \mathcal{E}(v_0)) \geq (1 - C\varepsilon)\Sigma(u_0\overline{v}_0). \tag{3.29}$$

We conclude combining (3.28) and (3.29). □

Proof of (1.16). Use (1.20) and (3.27). □

3.3 About equality cases in (1.22)

It is interesting to decide whether there exist maps $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega; \mathbb{S}^1)$ for which equality holds in any of the two inequalities in (1.22). Consider the following properties of a smooth bounded domain Ω in $\mathbb{R}^N$, $N \geq 2$:

(P_1) There exists $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega; \mathbb{S}^1)$ such that

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u| = \Sigma(u) > 0. \tag{3.30}$$

(P_2) There exists $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega; \mathbb{S}^1)$ such that

$$d_{W^{1,1}}(u, \mathcal{E}(1)) = \Sigma(u) > 0. \tag{3.31}$$

(P_2^*) There exist $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega; \mathbb{S}^1)$ with $\Sigma(u) > 0$ and $v \in \mathcal{E}(1)$ for which

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla(u - v)| = d_{W^{1,1}}(u, \mathcal{E}(1)) = \Sigma(u). \tag{3.32}$$

(P_3) There exists $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega; \mathbb{S}^1)$ such that

$$d_{W^{1,1}}(u, \mathcal{E}(1)) = \frac{2}{\pi}\Sigma(u) > 0. \tag{3.33}$$

(P_3^*) There exist $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega; \mathbb{S}^1)$ with $\Sigma(u) > 0$ and $v \in \mathcal{E}(1)$ for which

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla(u - v)| = d_{W^{1,1}}(u, \mathcal{E}(1)) = \frac{2}{\pi}\Sigma(u). \tag{3.34}$$

Very little is known about domains satisfying any of the above properties. The unit disc $\Omega = B(0,1)$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$ is an example of a domain for which (P_1) is satisfied. Indeed, for $u = x/|x|$ we have by Remark 1.5,

$$\Sigma\left(\frac{x}{|x|}\right) = 2\pi L\left(\frac{x}{|x|}\right) = 2\pi = \int_\Omega \left|\nabla\left(\frac{x}{|x|}\right)\right|,$$

whence (P_1) holds. In view of the following proposition we know that (P_3^*) is also satisfied for $\Omega = B(0,1)$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$.

Proposition 3.6. *Properties (P_1) and (P_3^*) are equivalent. More precisely, let $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$ with $\Sigma(u) > 0$. Then, the following are equivalent:*

(a) u satisfies (3.30).

(b) There exist $u_0 \in \mathcal{E}(u)$ and $v \in \mathcal{E}(1)$ such that $\displaystyle\int_\Omega |\nabla(u_0 - v)| = \frac{2}{\pi}\Sigma(u)$.

Proof of "(a) $\Longrightarrow$ (b)". Use Proposition 2.4 to find $\zeta_0 \in \mathbb{S}^1$ such that $v = P_{\zeta_0} \circ u \in \mathcal{E}(1)$ satisfies

$$d_{W^{1,1}}(u, \mathcal{E}(1)) \leq \int_\Omega |\nabla(u - v)| \leq \frac{2}{\pi}\int_\Omega |\nabla u| = \frac{2}{\pi}\Sigma(u), \tag{3.35}$$

and the result follows, with $u_0 = u$, since by (1.24) we have

$$d_{W^{1,1}}(u, \mathcal{E}(1)) \geq \frac{2}{\pi}\Sigma(u). \tag{3.36}$$

Proof of "(b) $\Longrightarrow$ (a)". Let u_0 and v be as in statement *(b)*. Set $w_0 := u_0\overline{v}$, so that $w_0 \sim u_0$. By assumption and (2.2) we have:

$$\frac{2}{\pi}\Sigma(u_0) \leq \int_\Omega |\nabla(|w_0 - 1|)| = \int_\Omega |\nabla(|u_0 - v|)| \leq \int_\Omega |\nabla(u_0 - v)| = \frac{2}{\pi}\Sigma(u_0). \tag{3.37}$$

Set $w_1 := T \circ w_0$, where $T : \mathbb{S}^1 \to \mathbb{S}^1$ is given by (2.3). By Lemma 2.1, $w_1 \sim w_0 \sim u_0$, and by (2.6) and (3.37) we obtain that

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla w_1| = \frac{\pi}{2}\int_\Omega |\nabla(|w_0 - 1|)| = \Sigma(u). \qquad \square$$

We do not know any domain Ω in $\mathbb{R}^2$ for which (3.30) fails and we ask:

Open Problem 1. Is there a domain Ω in $\mathbb{R}^N$, $N \geq 2$, for which property (P_1) does not hold?

It seems plausible that if Ω is the interior of a non circular ellipse, then (P_1) fails. We also do not know whether properties (P_3) and (P_3^*) are equivalent.

Concerning properties (P_2) and (P_2^*) we know even less:

Open Problem 2. Is there a domain Ω for which (P_2) holds (respectively, fails)?

We suspect that (P_2) is satisfied in *every* domain, but we do not know *any* such domain. In particular, we do not know what happens when Ω is a disc in $\mathbb{R}^2$.

4 Distances in $W^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$, $1<p<\infty$

Throughout this section we study classes in $W^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$, where $1<p<\infty$ and Ω is a smooth bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$, $N\geq 2$. We give below the proofs of the results stated in the Introduction.

4.1 Proof of Theorem 1.7

Proof of Theorem 1.7. The result is a direct consequence of the following analog of Corollary 2.3: for every $u,v\in W^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$ we have

$$\|\nabla(u-v)\|_{L^p(\Omega)}\geq \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)\inf_{w\sim u\overline{v}}\|\nabla w\|_{L^p(\Omega)}. \tag{4.1}$$

The proof of (4.1) uses an argument identical to the one used in the proofs of Lemma 2.2 and Corollary 2.3. Indeed, we first note that

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla(u-v)|^p\geq \int_\Omega |\nabla(|u-v|)|^p=\int_\Omega |\nabla(|u\overline{v}-1|)|^p. \tag{4.2}$$

Next, by (2.5) we have

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla(|u\overline{v}-1|)|^p=\left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^p\int_\Omega |\nabla(T\circ(u\overline{v}))|^p\geq \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^p\inf_{w\sim u\overline{v}}\int_\Omega|\nabla w|^p. \tag{4.3}$$

The result clearly follows by combining (4.2) with (4.3). □

4.2 Proof of Theorem 1.9

We shall need the following technical lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *For every $w_0\in W^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$ we have*

$$\inf_{w\sim w_0}\|\nabla(|w-1|)\|_{L^p(\Omega)}=\left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)\inf_{w\sim w_0}\|\nabla w\|_{L^p(\Omega)}. \tag{4.4}$$

Proof. The inequality "$\geq$" follows from (4.3) (taking $v=1$) so it remains to prove the reverse inequality. The argument is almost identical to the one used in the proof of [14, Prop 3.1]; we reproduce the argument for the convenience of the reader. We shall need the inverse $S:=T^{-1}$ of $T:\mathbb{S}^1\to\mathbb{S}^1$ that was defined in (2.3). It is given by:

$$S(e^{\imath\theta})=e^{\imath\phi},\quad \text{with } \phi=2\sin^{-1}(\theta/\pi),\ \forall\,\theta\in(-\pi,\pi].$$

This map belongs to $C(\mathbb{S}^1;\mathbb{S}^1)\cap C^1(\mathbb{S}^1\setminus\{-1\};\mathbb{S}^1)$ but it is not Lipschitz. We therefore define, for each small $\varepsilon>0$, an approximation S_ε by:

$$S_\varepsilon(e^{\imath\theta})=e^{\imath\phi}\ \text{ with } \phi=2\sin^{-1}\left(J_\varepsilon(\theta/\pi)\right),\ \forall\,\theta\in(-\pi,\pi], \tag{4.5}$$

where J_ε satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} J_\varepsilon(\pm1)=\pm1,\ J_\varepsilon'(\pm1)&=0,\\ J_\varepsilon(t)=t,\quad &\text{for } |t|\leq 1-\varepsilon,\\ 0<J_\varepsilon'(t)<c_0,\quad &\text{for } |t|<1,\\ \frac{c_1}{\varepsilon}\leq|J_\varepsilon''(t)|\leq\frac{c_2}{\varepsilon},\quad &\text{for } 1-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\leq|t|\leq 1, \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

for some positive constants c_0, c_1, c_2 (independent of ε). Clearly $S_\varepsilon \in C^1(\mathbb{S}^1;\mathbb{S}^1)$ with $\deg(S_\varepsilon) = 1$, so by Lemma 2.1, for any $w \in \mathcal{E}(w_0)$ we have $w_\varepsilon := S_\varepsilon \circ w \in \mathcal{E}(w_0)$. Since $|S_\varepsilon(e^{\imath\theta}) - 1| = 2|J_\varepsilon(\theta/\pi)|$ it follows from (4.6) that

$$\left| \frac{d}{d\theta} \left(|S_\varepsilon(e^{\imath\theta}) - 1| \right) \right| \le C, \ \forall\, \theta, \forall\, \varepsilon. \tag{4.7}$$

Put $A_\varepsilon := \{x \in \Omega : w(x) \in \mathcal{A}(-\pi(1-\varepsilon), \pi(1-\varepsilon))\}$. By (2.5),

$$\big|\nabla |w_\varepsilon - 1|\big| = \frac{2}{\pi} |\nabla w| \text{ a.e. on } A_\varepsilon,$$

while, by (4.7),

$$\big|\nabla |w_\varepsilon - 1|\big| \le C |\nabla w| \text{ a.e. on } \Omega.$$

Therefore, by dominated convergence,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \int_\Omega \big|\nabla |w_\varepsilon - 1|\big|^p = \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^p \int_\Omega |\nabla w|^p,$$

and since the above is valid for any $w \in \mathcal{E}(w_0)$, the inequality "$\le$" in (4.4) follows. □

The next lemma is the main ingredient of the proof of Theorem 1.9.

Lemma 4.2. *For every $w \in W^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$ and $0 < \delta < 1$ there exist a set $A = A(w,\delta) \subset \Omega$ and two functions $w_0, w_1 \in W^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1)$ such that:*
(i) $w_1 = \overline{w}_0$ in $\Omega \setminus A$;
(ii) $w_0 = w_1$ in A;
(iii) $w_1 \in \mathcal{E}(w)$ and $w_0 \in \mathcal{E}(1)$;
(iv) $\int_\Omega |\nabla(w_1 - w_0)|^p \le (1 + C_p\delta) \int_\Omega |\nabla |w-1||^p$;
(v) $\int_\Omega |\nabla w_1|^p = \int_\Omega |\nabla w_0|^p \le C(\delta,p) \int_\Omega |\nabla w|^p$.

Proof. Let I denote the open arc of $\mathbb{S}^1$, $I := \mathcal{A}(2\pi - \delta, 2\pi) = \{e^{\imath\theta} : \theta \in (2\pi - \delta, 2\pi)\}$, and let $A := w^{-1}(I)$. Define $T_1 : \mathbb{S}^1 \to \mathbb{S}^1$ by

$$T_1(e^{\imath\theta}) = \begin{cases} e^{\imath\pi\theta/(2\pi-\delta)}, & \text{if } 0 \le \theta \le 2\pi - \delta \\ (-1)e^{\imath\pi(\theta-(2\pi-\delta))/\delta}, & \text{if } 2\pi - \delta < \theta < 2\pi \end{cases}.$$

Note that the image of T_1, restricted to the arc $\mathbb{S}^1 \setminus I$ is $\mathbb{S}^1_+$, and that $\mathbb{S}^1_+$ is covered counterclockwise. Similarly, on the arc I, the image of T_1 is $\mathbb{S}^1_-$, covered again counterclockwise. It follows that $\deg(T_1) = 1$. Next we define $T_0 : \mathbb{S}^1 \to \mathbb{S}^1$ by $P_{-1} \circ T_1$ (see (2.10)), or explicitly by

$$T_0(e^{\imath\theta}) := \begin{cases} \overline{T_1(e^{\imath\theta})}, & \text{if } 0 \le \theta \le 2\pi - \delta \\ T_1(e^{\imath\theta}), & \text{if } 2\pi - \delta < \theta < 2\pi \end{cases}.$$

Clearly $\deg(T_0) = 0$. Define $w_0 := T_0 \circ w$ and $w_1 := T_1 \circ w$.

Properties *(i)–(ii)* are direct consequences of the definition of w_0, w_1. The fact that $w_0 \in \mathcal{E}(1)$ and $w_1 \in \mathcal{E}(w)$ (i.e., property *(iii)*) follows from Lemma 2.1. Since T_0 and T_1 are Lipschitz maps (actually, piecewise smooth, with a single corner at $z = e^{\imath(2\pi-\delta)}$), the chain rule implies that

$$|\nabla w_0| = |\nabla w_1| \le \begin{cases} (\pi/\delta)\, |\nabla w|, & \text{a.e. in } A \\ (\pi/(2\pi-1))\, |\nabla w|, & \text{a.e. in } \Omega \setminus A \end{cases},$$

whence property *(v)*. Finally, in order to verify property *(iv)* we first notice that on $\Omega \setminus A$ we have

$$\widetilde{w} := w_1 \, \overline{w}_0 = w_1^2 = Q \circ w,$$

where $Q(e^{\imath\theta}) := e^{2\imath\theta\pi/(2\pi-\delta)}$ for $\theta \in (0, 2\pi - \delta)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega |\nabla(w_1 - w_0)|^p &= \int_{\Omega\setminus A} |\nabla(w_1 - w_0)|^p = \int_{\Omega\setminus A} \big|\nabla|w_1 - w_0|\big|^p = \int_{\Omega\setminus A} \big|\nabla|\widetilde{w} - 1|\big|^p \\ &\leq (1 + C_p\delta) \int_{\Omega\setminus A} \big|\nabla|w - 1|\big|^p \leq (1 + C_p\delta) \int_\Omega \big|\nabla|w - 1|\big|^p. \qquad \square\end{aligned}$$

We are now in a position to present the

Proof of Theorem 1.9. In view of Theorem 1.7 we only need to prove the inequality "$\leq$" in (1.31). For any $w \in \mathcal{E}(u_0)$ we may apply Lemma 4.2 with a sequence $\delta_n \to 0$ to obtain that

$$d_{W^{1,p}}(\mathcal{E}(u_0), \mathcal{E}(1)) \leq \inf_{w\sim u_0} \|\nabla|w - 1|\|_{L^p(\Omega)},$$

and the result follows from Lemma 4.1. $\square$

4.3 Proof of Theorem 1.11

We next turn to the unboundedness of the $\mathrm{Dist}_{W^{1,p}}$-distance between distinct classes.

Proof of Theorem 1.11 when $u_0 = 1$. For every $n \geq 1$ let

$$u_n := e^{\imath n x_1} \quad \text{(we write } x = (x_1, \dots, x_N)\text{)},$$

so clearly $u_n \in C^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{S}^1) \subset \mathcal{E}(1)$. We claim that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} d_{W^{1,p}}(u_n, \mathcal{E}(v_0)) = \infty, \tag{4.8}$$

which implies of course (1.32) in this case. Fix a small $\varepsilon > 0$, e.g., $\varepsilon = \pi/8$. For each $v \in \mathcal{E}(v_0)$ let $w_n := \overline{u}_n \, v$ and define the set A_ε as in (3.6), with $\widetilde{u} = u_n$. Note that $|\nabla u_n(x)| = n$, $x \in \Omega$, so by Lemma 3.3 we have

$$|\nabla(u_n - v)| \geq n \sin\varepsilon \text{ a.e. in } A_\varepsilon. \tag{4.9}$$

Therefore,

$$\int_{A_\varepsilon} |\nabla(u_n - v)|^p \geq |A_\varepsilon| (\sin\varepsilon)^p n^p = c_1 |A_\varepsilon| n^p. \tag{4.10}$$

Using (3.5) instead of (3.4) in the computation leading to (4.9) yields

$$|\nabla(u_n - v)| \geq \left(\frac{\sin\varepsilon}{2}\right) (|\nabla u_n| + |\nabla v|) \geq \left(\frac{\sin\varepsilon}{2}\right) |\nabla w_n|, \quad \text{a.e. in } A_\varepsilon. \tag{4.11}$$

We set $\widetilde{w}_n := K_\varepsilon \circ w_n$ (see (3.19)) and recall that $K_\varepsilon \in \mathrm{Lip}(\mathbb{S}^1; \mathbb{S}^1)$, $\|\dot{K}_\varepsilon\|_\infty = \pi/(\pi - 2\varepsilon)$ and $\deg(K_\varepsilon) = 1$. We have $\widetilde{w}_n \in \mathcal{E}(v_0)$ and $\nabla\widetilde{w}_n = 0$ a.e. in $\Omega \setminus A_\varepsilon$. By (1.4),

$$\int_{A_\varepsilon} |\nabla\widetilde{w}_n| = \int_\Omega |\nabla\widetilde{w}_n| \geq \Sigma(v_0). \tag{4.12}$$

Using Hölder inequality and (4.12) gives

$$\int_{A_\varepsilon} |\nabla \widetilde{w}_n|^p \geq \frac{\left(\int_{A_\varepsilon} |\nabla \widetilde{w}_n|\right)^p}{|A_\varepsilon|^{p-1}} \geq \frac{(\Sigma(v_0))^p}{|A_\varepsilon|^{p-1}}. \tag{4.13}$$

Since $|\nabla w_n| \geq (1 - 2\varepsilon/\pi)|\nabla \widetilde{w}_n|$ on Ω we obtain by combining (4.11) and (4.13) that

$$\int_{A_\varepsilon} |\nabla(u_n - v)|^p \geq \frac{c_2}{|A_\varepsilon|^{p-1}}, \tag{4.14}$$

whence,

$$|A_\varepsilon| \geq c_2^{1/(p-1)} \left(\int_{A_\varepsilon} |\nabla(u_n - v)|^p\right)^{-1/(p-1)}. \tag{4.15}$$

Plugging (4.15) in (4.10) finally yields

$$\int_{A_\varepsilon} |\nabla(u_n - v)|^p \geq c_3 n^{p-1},$$

and (4.8) follows.

Proof of Theorem Theorem 1.11 in the general case. Consider an arbitrary $u_0 \in W^{1,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{S}^1)$. We set $u_n := e^{inx_1}\, u_0 \in \mathcal{E}(u_0)$. By the triangle inequality,

$$|\nabla(e^{inx_1} - \overline{u}_0\, v)| = |\nabla\left(\overline{u}_0(u_n - v)\right)| \leq |\nabla(u_n - v)| + 2|\nabla \overline{u}_0|.$$

Therefore,

$$\|\nabla(u_n - v)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \geq \|\nabla(e^{inx_1} - \overline{u}_0 v)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} - 2\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^p(\Omega)},$$

and the result follows from the first part of the proof. □

4.4 An example of strict inequality in (1.30)

Proposition 4.3. *There exist a smooth, bounded simply connected domain Ω in $\mathbb{R}^2$ and $u_0, v_0 \in \bigcap_{1\leq p<2} W^{1,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{S}^1)$ such that*

$$\operatorname{dist}_{W^{1,p}}(\mathcal{E}(u_0), \mathcal{E}(v_0)) > \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right) \inf_{w \sim u_0 \overline{v}_0} \|\nabla w\|_{L^p(\Omega)}, \quad 1 < p < 2. \tag{4.16}$$

Proof. The construction resembles the one used in the proof of [14, Proposition 4.1] (for a multiply connected domain and $p = 2$), but the details of the proof are quite different.

Step 1. Definition of Ω_ε and u_0, v_0
Consider the three unit discs with centers at the points $a_- := (-3, 0), a := (0, 0)$ and $a_+ := (3, 0)$, respectively:

$$B_- := B(a_-, 1),\ B := B(a, 1) \ \text{ and } B_+ := B(a_+, 1).$$

For a small $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/4)$, to be determined later, define the domain Ω_ε by

$$\Omega_\varepsilon := B_- \cup B \cup B_+ \cup \{(x_1, x_2);\ x_1 \in (-3, 3), x_2 \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)\}. \tag{4.17}$$



Figure 1: The domain Ω_ε (before smoothing)

Hence, B is connected to B_- and B_+ by two narrow tubes (see Figure 1). We can enlarge Ω_ε slightly near the "corners"=the contact points of the tubes with the circles, in order to have a smooth Ω_ε. But we do it keeping the following property:

$$\Omega_\varepsilon \text{ is symmetric with respect to reflections in both the } x \text{ and } y\text{-axis.} \tag{4.18}$$

For later use we denote by Ω_+ and Ω_- the two components of $\Omega_\varepsilon \setminus \overline{B}$ (with $\Omega_+ \subset \{z;\ \mathrm{Re}\ z > 0\}$). We define the maps $u_0, v_0 \in \bigcap_{1\le p<2} W^{1,p}(\Omega_\varepsilon;\mathbb{S}^1)$ by

$$u_0 := \left(\frac{x-a_-}{|x-a_-|}\right)\left(\frac{x}{|x|}\right)^2\left(\frac{x-a_+}{|x-a_+|}\right),\ v_0 := \left(\frac{x-a_-}{|x-a_-|}\right)\left(\frac{x}{|x|}\right)\left(\frac{x-a_+}{|x-a_+|}\right), \tag{4.19}$$

and then

$$w_0 := u_0\,\overline{v}_0 = \frac{x}{|x|}. \tag{4.20}$$

Step 2. Properties of energy minimizers in $\mathcal{E}(w_0)$
We denote by $W_\varepsilon \in W^{1,p}(\Omega_\varepsilon;\mathbb{S}^1)$ a map realizing the minimum in

$$S_\varepsilon = \inf_{w\sim w_0} \|\nabla w\|_{L^p(\Omega_\varepsilon)}. \tag{4.21}$$

Note that the minimizer W_ε is unique, up to multiplication by a complex constant of modulo one. This follows from the strict convexity of the functional:

$$F(\varphi) = \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}\left|\nabla\left(e^{i\varphi}\frac{x}{|x|}\right)\right|^p \quad \text{over } \varphi \in W^{1,p}(\Omega_\varepsilon;\mathbb{R}). \tag{4.22}$$

We next claim that

$$\int_B\left|\nabla\left(\frac{x}{|x|}\right)\right|^p \le \int_B |\nabla W_\varepsilon|^p \le \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}|\nabla W_\varepsilon|^p \le \int_B\left|\nabla\left(\frac{x}{|x|}\right)\right|^p + C\varepsilon^2, \tag{4.23}$$

for some constant C. Here and in the sequel we denote by C different constants that are independent of ε and p. Indeed, the first inequality in (4.23) is clear since the restriction of W_ε to B belongs to the class of $x/|x|$ in B, and the latter map is a minimizer of the energy in its class (see Remark 4.4 below). For the proof of the last inequality in (4.23) it suffices to construct a comparison map $\widetilde{w} \in \mathcal{E}(w_0)$ as follows. We first set $\widetilde{w} = x/|x|$ in B. Then extend it to $\Omega_+ \cap \{x_1 \le 1+\varepsilon\}$ in such a way that $\widetilde{w} \equiv \zeta$ (for some constant $\zeta \in \mathbb{S}^1$) on $\Omega_+ \cap \{x_1 = 1+\varepsilon\}$. Such an extension can be constructed with $\|\nabla\widetilde{w}\|_{L^\infty} \le C$, whence

$$\int_{\Omega_+\cap\{x_1<1+\varepsilon\}} |\nabla\widetilde{w}|^p \le C\varepsilon^2.$$

In the remaining part of Ω_+, namely $\Omega_+ \cap \{x_1 > 1+\varepsilon\}$ we simply set $\widetilde{w} \equiv \zeta$. We use a similar construction for $\widetilde{w}$ on Ω_-, and this completes the proof of (4.23).

We shall also use a certain symmetry property of W_ε. We claim that:

$$W_\varepsilon(x) = -W_\varepsilon(-x) \ \text{ in } \Omega_\varepsilon. \tag{4.24}$$

Indeed, since $W_\varepsilon(-x)$ is also a minimizer in (4.21), we must have

$$W_\varepsilon(-x) = e^{\imath\alpha}\, W_\varepsilon(x) \text{ for some constant } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{4.25}$$

Write

$$W_\varepsilon = e^{\imath\Psi_\varepsilon} \left(\frac{x}{|x|}\right), \text{ with } \Psi_\varepsilon \in W^{1,p}(\Omega_\varepsilon;\mathbb{R}). \tag{4.26}$$

Plugging (4.26) in (4.25) gives

$$-e^{\imath\Psi_\varepsilon(-x)} \left(\frac{x}{|x|}\right) = e^{\imath\alpha}\, e^{\imath\Psi_\varepsilon(x)} \left(\frac{x}{|x|}\right),$$

whence $e^{\imath(\Psi_\varepsilon(-x)-\Psi_\varepsilon(x))} = -e^{\imath\alpha}$. It follows that $\Psi_\varepsilon(-x)-\Psi_\varepsilon(x) \equiv const$ in Ω_ε. Since $\Psi_\varepsilon(-x)-\Psi_\varepsilon(x)$ is odd, it follows that the constant must be zero. Hence $\Psi_\varepsilon(-x) = \Psi_\varepsilon(x)$ a.e. in Ω_ε, $e^{\imath\alpha} = -1$ and (4.24) follows from (4.25).

The main property of W_ε that we need is the following: there exists $\zeta_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{S}^1$ such that

$$|W_\varepsilon - \zeta_\varepsilon| \le c_0\, \varepsilon^{2/p} \text{ on } B_+, \tag{4.27}$$

$$|W_\varepsilon + \zeta_\varepsilon| \le c_0\, \varepsilon^{2/p} \text{ on } B_-. \tag{4.28}$$

In order to verify (4.27)–(4.28) we first notice that we may write $W_\varepsilon = e^{\imath\Phi_\varepsilon}$ in $\Omega_\varepsilon \cap \{x_1 > 1\}$. Using (4.23) and Fubini Theorem we can find $t_\varepsilon \in (1, 3/2)$ such that the segment $I_\varepsilon = \{(t_\varepsilon, x_2);\, x_2 \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)\}$ satisfies

$$\int_{I_\varepsilon} |\nabla\Phi_\varepsilon|^p = \int_{I_\varepsilon} |\nabla W_\varepsilon|^p \le C\varepsilon^2.$$

By Hölder inequality it follows that $|\Phi_\varepsilon(z_1) - \Phi_\varepsilon(z_2)| \le C\varepsilon^{2/p}$ for all $z_1, z_2 \in I_\varepsilon$. Hence, there exists $\alpha_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$|\Phi_\varepsilon(z) - \alpha_\varepsilon| \le C\varepsilon^{2/p}, \ \forall\, z \in I_\varepsilon. \tag{4.29}$$

We claim that (4.29) continues to hold in $G_\varepsilon := \Omega_\varepsilon \cap \{x_1 > t_\varepsilon\}$, i.e.,

$$|\Phi_\varepsilon(x) - \alpha_\varepsilon| \le C\varepsilon^{2/p}, \ \forall\, x \in G_\varepsilon. \tag{4.30}$$

Indeed, defining

$$\widetilde{\Phi}_\varepsilon(x) := \max\left(\alpha_\varepsilon - C\varepsilon^{2/p}, \min(\Phi_\varepsilon(x), \alpha_\varepsilon + C\varepsilon^{2/p})\right),$$

and then $\widetilde{W_\varepsilon} := e^{\imath\widetilde{\Phi}_\varepsilon}$, we clearly have $\int_{G_\varepsilon} |\nabla\widetilde{W_\varepsilon}|^p \le \int_{G_\varepsilon} |\nabla W_\varepsilon|^p$, with strict inequality, unless (4.30) holds. Setting $\zeta_\varepsilon := e^{\imath\alpha_\varepsilon}$, we deduce (4.27) from (4.30). Finally, using the symmetry properties, (4.18) of Ω_ε and (4.24) of Ψ_ε, we easily deduce (4.28) from (4.27).

Step 3. A basic estimate for maps in $W^{1,p}(\mathbb{S}^1;\mathbb{S}^1)$

The following claim provides a simple estimate which is essential for the proof. The case $p = 2$ was proved in [14, Lemma 4.1] and the generalization to any $p \ge 1$ is straightforward. We include the proof for the convenience of the reader.

Claim. *For any $p \geq 1$, let $f, g \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{S}^1;\mathbb{S}^1)$ satisfy:*

$$\deg f = \deg g = k \neq 0 \text{ and } |(f-g)(\zeta)| = \eta > 0,$$

for some point $\zeta \in \mathbb{S}^1$. Then,

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^1} |\dot{f} - \dot{g}|^p \geq \frac{2\eta^p}{\pi^{p-1}}. \tag{4.31}$$

Proof of Claim. Set $w := f - g$. We may assume without loss of generality that $w(1) = (f-g)(1) = \eta\, \imath$. There are two possibilities:

(i) $w(e^{\imath\theta_0}) = 0$ for some $\theta_0 \in (0, 2\pi)$. Hölder's inequality, and a straightforward computation yield

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^1} |w'|^p \geq \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} \big||w|'\big|^p \geq \frac{\eta^p}{\theta_0^{p-1}} + \frac{\eta^p}{(2\pi-\theta_0)^{p-1}} \geq \frac{2\eta^p}{(\theta_0(2\pi-\theta_0))^{(p-1)/2}} \geq \frac{2\eta^p}{\pi^{p-1}}.$$

(ii) $\gamma := \min\{|w(e^{\imath\theta})| : \theta \in [0, 2\pi)\} > 0$.
In this case the winding number of w with respect to 0 is also k. [This is proved using the homotopy $t \mapsto f - t\, g$, $t \in [0,1]$.] In particular, there exists some $\theta_1 \in (0, 2\pi)$ for which $w(e^{\imath\theta_1}) = -t\, \imath$, with $t \geq \gamma$. Writing $w = w_1 + \imath\, w_2$ we have by the same computation as above

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^1} |w'|^p \geq \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} |w_2'|^p \geq \frac{(\eta+t)^p}{\theta_1^{p-1}} + \frac{(\eta+t)^p}{(2\pi-\theta_1)^{p-1}} \geq 2\frac{(\eta+t)^p}{\pi^{p-1}} > \frac{2\eta^p}{\pi^{p-1}},$$

and (4.31) follows in this case too. □

Step 4. Conclusion
Consider two sequences $\{u_n\} \subset \mathcal{E}(u_0)$ and $\{v_n\} \subset \mathcal{E}(v_0)$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \|\nabla(u_n - v_n)\|_{L^p(\Omega_\varepsilon)} = \mathrm{dist}_{W^{1,p}}(\mathcal{E}(u_0), \mathcal{E}(v_0)). \tag{4.32}$$

By a standard density argument we may assume that $u_n, v_n \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega}_\varepsilon \setminus \{a_-, a, a_+\})$ for all n. Assume by contradiction that

$$\mathrm{dist}_{W^{1,p}}(\mathcal{E}(u_0), \mathcal{E}(v_0)) = \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right) S_\varepsilon = \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right) \min_{w\sim w_0} \|\nabla w\|_{L^p(\Omega_\varepsilon)} \text{ (see (4.21))}. \tag{4.33}$$

By (4.33) and (4.23) there exists a constant C_0 such that

$$\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} |\nabla(u_n - v_n)|^p \leq \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^p \int_B \left|\nabla\left(\frac{x}{|x|}\right)\right|^p + C_0\varepsilon^2, \ \forall\, n \geq n_0(\varepsilon). \tag{4.34}$$

Set $w_n := u_n\, \overline{v}_n$ and note that by the same computation as in (4.2)–(4.3) we have

$$\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} |\nabla(u_n - v_n)|^p \geq \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} |\nabla(|u_n - v_n|)|^p = \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^p \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} |\nabla(T \circ w_n)|^p \geq \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^p S_\varepsilon^p \tag{4.35}$$

(recall that T is defined in (2.3)). Combining (4.32),(4.33) and (4.35) yields that $\widetilde{w}_n := T \circ w_n$ satisfies

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \|\nabla \widetilde{w}_n\|_{L^p(\Omega_\varepsilon)} = S_\varepsilon,$$

and up to passing to a subsequence we have

$$W_\varepsilon = \lim_{n\to\infty} \widetilde{w}_n \ \text{ in } W^{1,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{S}^1), \tag{4.36}$$

where W_ε is a minimizer in (4.21). Recall that W_ε is unique up to rotations; the particular W_ε in (4.36) is chosen by the subsequence. For any $\zeta \in \mathbb{S}^1$ we have $\max(|\zeta-1|, |\zeta+1|) \geq \sqrt{2}$. In particular, for ζ_ε associated with W_ε (see (4.27)–(4.28)) we may assume without loss of generality that

$$|\zeta_\varepsilon - 1| \geq \sqrt{2}. \tag{4.37}$$

By (4.36) and Egorov Theorem there exists $A_\varepsilon \subset \Omega_\varepsilon$ satisfying

$$|A_\varepsilon| \leq \varepsilon \ \text{ and } \widetilde{w}_n \to W_\varepsilon \text{ uniformly on } \Omega_\varepsilon \setminus A_\varepsilon, \tag{4.38}$$

again, after passing to a subsequence. Combining (4.38) with (4.37) and (4.27) yields

$$|\widetilde{w}_n - 1| \geq \sqrt{2} - 2c_0\,\varepsilon \ \text{ on } B_+ \setminus A_\varepsilon, \ \forall\, n \geq n_1(\varepsilon),$$

and choosing $\varepsilon < (\sqrt{2}-1)/(2c_0)$ guarantees that

$$|\widetilde{w}_n - 1| \geq 1 \ \text{ on } B_+ \setminus A_\varepsilon, \ \forall\, n \geq n_1(\varepsilon). \tag{4.39}$$

Going back to the definition of T in (2.3), we find by a simple computation the following equivalences for $e^{i\theta} = T(e^{i\varphi})$ (with $\theta \in (-\pi,\pi)$):

$$|T(e^{i\varphi})-1| \geq 1 \iff |\theta| = \pi|\sin(\varphi/2)| \geq \pi/3 \iff |e^{i\varphi}-1| = 2|\sin(\varphi/2)| \geq 2/3. \tag{4.40}$$

Using (4.40) we may rewrite (4.39) in terms of the original sequence $\{w_n\}$:

$$|u_n - v_n| = |w_n - 1| \geq 2/3 \ \text{ on } B_+ \setminus A_\varepsilon, \ \forall\, n \geq n_1(\varepsilon). \tag{4.41}$$

Consider the set

$$\Lambda_\varepsilon = \{r \in (1/2,1);\, \partial B(a_+,r) \subset A_\varepsilon\}. \tag{4.42}$$

By (4.38) we clearly have $\varepsilon \geq |A_\varepsilon| \geq (1/2)|\Lambda_\varepsilon| \cdot 2\pi$, whence

$$|\Lambda_\varepsilon| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi}. \tag{4.43}$$

For $n \geq n_1(\varepsilon)$ we have: on each circle $\partial B(a_+,r)$ with $r \in (1/2,1)\setminus\Lambda_\varepsilon$ there exists at least one point where $|u_n - v_n| \geq 2/3$. Thus we may apply the Claim from Step 3 with $\eta := 2/3$, $f := u_n\big|_{\partial B(a_+,r)}$ and $g := v_n\big|_{\partial B(a_+,r)}$ to obtain by (4.31) (after a suitable rescaling):

$$\int_{\partial B(a_+,r)} |\nabla(u_n - v_n)|^p \geq 2(r\pi)^{1-p}\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^p \geq (2\pi)\left(\frac{2}{3\pi}\right)^p := \gamma_p. \tag{4.44}$$

Integrating (4.44), taking into account (4.43), yields

$$\int_{B_+} |\nabla(u_n - v_n)|^p \geq \int_{(1/2,1)\setminus\Lambda_\varepsilon}\int_{\partial B(a_+,r)} |\nabla(u_n - v_n)|^p \geq (1/2 - \varepsilon/\pi)\gamma_p. \tag{4.45}$$

In addition, by (1.30), applied to $u_n\big|_B, v_n\big|_B$, we clearly have

$$\int_B |\nabla(u_n - v_n)|^p \geq \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^p \int_B \left|\nabla\left(\frac{x}{|x|}\right)\right|^p,$$

which together with (4.45) gives

$$\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} |\nabla(u_n - v_n)|^p \geq \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^p \int_B \left|\nabla\left(\frac{x}{|x|}\right)\right|^p + (1/2 - \varepsilon/\pi)\gamma_p, \ \forall\, n \geq n_1(\varepsilon). \tag{4.46}$$

The inequality (4.46) clearly contradicts (4.34) for n large enough if ε is chosen sufficiently small. □

Remark 4.4. In the course of the proof of Proposition 4.3 we used the following fact:

Let $1 \leq p < 2$ and let Ω be the unit disc. Set $u_0(x) := x/|x|$, $\forall\, x \in \Omega$. Then

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^p \geq \int_\Omega |\nabla u_0|^p, \ \forall\, u \in \mathcal{E}(u_0). \tag{4.47}$$

We sketch the proof for the convenience of the reader.

Let $u \in \mathcal{E}(u_0)$. Let $C_r := \{z;\, |z| = r\}$. Since we may write $u = e^{\imath\varphi}\, u_0$, with $\varphi \in W^{1,p}$, for a.e. $r \in (0,1)$ we have $u\big|_{C_r} \in W^{1,p}(C_r; \mathbb{S}^1)$ and $\deg\left(u\big|_{C_r}\right) = 1$. This implies that for a.e. $r \in (0,1)$ we have

$$\int_{C_r} |\nabla u| \geq \int_{C_r} |\dot{u}| = \int_{C_r} |u \wedge \dot{u}| \geq \int_{C_r} u \wedge \dot{u} = 2\pi = \int_{C_r} u_0 \wedge \dot{u}_0 = \int_{C_r} |\nabla u_0|. \tag{4.48}$$

In case $p = 1$ integration over $r \in (0,1)$ of (4.48) yields (4.47). In case $1 < p < 2$ we use (4.48) and Hölder inequality, and then integration over r yields

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^p \geq 2\pi \int_0^1 \frac{dr}{r^{p-1}} = \frac{2\pi}{2-p} = \int_\Omega |\nabla u_0|^p, \text{ and (4.47) follows.}$$

Examining the equality cases for the inequalities in (4.48) (and in Hölder inequality when $1 < p < 2$) we obtain in addition the following conclusion: equality holds in (4.47) if and only if

(i) for $1 < p < 2$, $u = e^{\imath\alpha} u_0$ for some constant α;
(ii) for $p = 1$, $u(re^{\imath\theta}) = e^{i\varphi(\theta)}$ where $\varphi \in W^{1,1}([0, 2\pi]; \mathbb{R})$ satisfies $\varphi(2\pi) - \varphi(0) = 2\pi$ and $\varphi' \geq 0$ a.e. on $[0, 2\pi]$.
The difference between (i) and (ii) is the main reason why for the same u_0 and v_0 as in the proof of Proposition 4.3, we have the strict inequality (4.16) for $1 < p < 2$, while for $p = 1$ the equality (1.15) holds.

Remark 4.5. Consider the maps $u_1 := x/|x|$ and $v_1 := 1$ in Ω_ε (as in the proof of Proposition 4.3). By Theorem 1.9 we have $\mathrm{dist}_{W^{1,p}}(\mathcal{E}(u_1), \mathcal{E}(v_1)) = (2/\pi)\inf_{w \sim u_1\overline{v}_1} \|\nabla w\|_{L^p(\Omega_\varepsilon)}$. Therefore, we have

$$\mathrm{dist}_{W^{1,p}}(\mathcal{E}(u_1), \mathcal{E}(v_1)) \neq \mathrm{dist}_{W^{1,p}}(\mathcal{E}(u_0), \mathcal{E}(v_0))$$

although $u_1\overline{v}_1 = u_0\overline{v}_0$. This shows that in general it is not even true that $\mathrm{dist}_{W^{1,p}}(\mathcal{E}(u), \mathcal{E}(v))$ depends only on $\mathcal{E}(u\overline{v})$ when $1 < p < 2$. A similar phenomenon occurs when Ω is multiply connected and $p = 2$ (see [14, Remark 4.1]); a comparable argument works for $p > 2$.

Appendix. Proof of Proposition 1.2

Proof of Proposition 1.2. We fix a sequence $\varepsilon_n \searrow 0$ and use (1.4) to find a sequence $\{v_n\} \subset \mathcal{E}(u)$ such that

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla v_n| \le \Sigma(u) + \varepsilon_n, \ \forall\, n. \tag{A.1}$$

For $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$ define $\Psi_{n,\theta} \in \mathrm{Lip}(\mathbb{S}^1; \mathbb{S}^1)$ by

$$\Psi_{n,\theta}(z) := \begin{cases} e^{\imath\pi(1+2(\varphi-\theta)/\varepsilon_n)}, & \text{if } z = e^{\imath\varphi} \in \mathcal{A}(\theta - \varepsilon_n/2, \theta + \varepsilon_n/2) \\ 1, & \text{if } z \notin \mathcal{A}(\theta - \varepsilon_n/2, \theta + \varepsilon_n/2) \end{cases}. \tag{A.2}$$

Clearly $\deg \Psi_{n,\theta} = 1$, so setting $w_{n,\theta} := \Psi_{n,\theta} \circ v_n$, we have, by Lemma 2.1, $w_{n,\theta} \sim v_n \sim u$. Moreover,

$$|\nabla w_{n,\theta}(x)| = \begin{cases} (2\pi/\varepsilon_n)\, |\nabla v_n(x)|, & \text{if } v_n(x) \in \mathcal{A}(\theta - \varepsilon_n/2, \theta + \varepsilon_n/2) \\ 0, & \text{if } v_n(x) \notin \mathcal{A}(\theta - \varepsilon_n/2, \theta + \varepsilon_n/2) \end{cases}. \tag{A.3}$$

Set

$$A_n(x) := \{\theta \in [0, 2\pi);\, v_n(x) \in \mathcal{A}(\theta - \varepsilon_n/2, \theta + \varepsilon_n/2)\},$$
$$B_n(x) := \{\theta \in [0, 2\pi);\, w_{n,\theta}(x) \in \mathcal{A}(\theta - \varepsilon_n/2, \theta + \varepsilon_n/2)\}.$$

We have

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \int_\Omega |\nabla w_{n,\theta}|\, dx\, d\theta = \frac{2\pi}{\varepsilon_n} \int_\Omega |\nabla v_n(x)|\, |A_{n,\varepsilon}(x)|\, dx = 2\pi \int_\Omega |\nabla v_n|, \tag{A.4}$$

and

$$\int_0^{2\pi} |\{w_{n,\theta} \neq 1\}|\, d\theta = \int_\Omega |B_n(x)|\, dx = \varepsilon_n\, |\Omega|. \tag{A.5}$$

Combining (A.1) with (A.4)–(A.5) yields

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \left(|\{w_{n,\theta} \neq 1\}|/\varepsilon_n^{1/2} + \int_\Omega |\nabla w_{n,\theta}| \right) d\theta \le |\Omega|\, \varepsilon_n^{1/2} + 2\pi(\Sigma(u) + \varepsilon_n). \tag{A.6}$$

From (A.6) it follows that there exists $\theta_n \in [0, 2\pi)$ such that

$$|\{w_{n,\theta_n} \neq 1\}|/\varepsilon_n^{1/2} + \int_\Omega |\nabla w_{n,\theta_n}| \le |\Omega|\, \varepsilon_n^{1/2}/(2\pi) + \Sigma(u) + \varepsilon_n;$$

so clearly $u_n := w_{n,\theta_n}$ satisfies (1.17).

□

References

[1] F. Bethuel, *A characterization of maps in $H^1(B^3, \mathbb{S}^2)$ which can be approximated by smooth maps*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **7** (1990), 269-286.

[2] F. Bethuel and X.M. Zheng, *Density of smooth functions between two manifolds in Sobolev spaces*, J. Funct. Anal., **80** (1988), 60–75.

[3] J. Bourgain, H. Brezis and P. Mironescu, *Lifting in Sobolev spaces*, J. Anal. Math. **80** (2000), 37-86.

[4] H. Brezis and Y.Y. Li, *Topology and Sobolev spaces*, J. Funct. Anal. **183** (2001), 321-369.

[5] H. Brezis and P. Mironescu, *On some questions of topology for $\mathbb{S}^1$-valued fractional Sobolev spaces*, RACSAM. Rev. R. Acad. Cienc. Exactas Fs. Nat. Ser. A Mat. **95** (2001), 121-143.

[6] H. Brezis and P. Mironescu, Sobolev maps with values into the circle, Birkhäuser (in preparation).

[7] H. Brezis, P. Mironescu and A. Ponce, *$W^{1,1}$-maps with values into $\mathbb{S}^1$*, in Geometric analysis of PDE and several complex variables, Contemp. Math., **368**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2005, 69–100.

[8] H. Brezis, P. Mironescu and I. Shafrir, *Distances between homotopy classes of $W^{s,p}(\mathbb{S}^N;\mathbb{S}^N)$*, ESAIM COCV, to appear.

[9] H. Brezis, P. Mironescu and I. Shafrir, *Distances between classes of sphere-valued Sobolev maps*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I **354** (2016).

[10] F. Demengel, *Une caractérisation des applications de $W^{1,p}(B^N,\mathbb{S}^1)$ qui peuvent être approchées par des fonctions régulières*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. **310** (1990), 553-557.

[11] F. Hang and F.H. Lin, *Topology of Sobolev mappings II*, Acta Math. **191** (2003), 55-107.

[12] S. Levi and I. Shafrir, *On the distance between homotopy classes of maps between spheres*, J. Fixed Point Theory Appl. **15** (2014), 501–518.

[13] A.C. Ponce and J. Van Schaftingen, *Closure of smooth maps in $W^{1,p}(B^3;\mathbb{S}^2)$*, Differential Integral Equations, **22** (2009), 881-900.

[14] J. Rubinstein and I. Shafrir, *The distance between homotopy classes of $\mathbb{S}^1$-valued maps in multiply connected domains*, Israel J. Math. **160** (2007), 41–59.

[15] J. Rubinstein and P. Sternberg, *Homotopy classification of minimizers of the Ginzburg-Landau energy and the existence of permanent currents*, Comm. Math. Phys. **179** (1996), 257-263.

[16] R. Schoen and K. Uhlenbeck, *Boundary regularity and the Dirichlet problem for harmonic maps*, J. Differential Geom. 18 (1983), 253-268.

[17] B. White, *Homotopy classes in Sobolev spaces and the existence of energy minimizing maps*, Acta Math. **160** (1988),1-17.